UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

And What About Palestine? - - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Do Unitarians Worship? - *Alfred Stiernotte*

The Free Mind Is Practical - - - - - - - - - - *Randall S. Hilton*

Western Unitarian Conference News

VOLUME CXXX NUMBER 7

Chicago, September, 1944

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of The Fourth Unitarian Congregational Church in Brooklyn, New York.

Randall S. Hilton: Executive Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference.

Alfred Stiernotte: Minister of the First Unitarian Church, Vancouver, B. C.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 99

Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 102

ARTICLES—

And What About Palestine?—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 102

Do Unitarians Worship?—ALFRED STIERNOTTE 106

The Free Mind Is Practical—RANDALL S. HILTON 108

THE STUDY TABLE—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 109

CORRESPONDENCE—

Debts, Taxation, Income—VICTOR S. YARROS 111

One More Letter—MRS. SIDNEY A. SHERMAN 111

Brotherhood—KEN M. NIKAIDO 111

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE NEWS 112

THE FIELD—

Quota Education—Editorial from *The Protestant* 98

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Quota Education

The basic political rights, under which minorities in this country have been enabled to strive for their particular rights, were established here by Protestant refugees from Europe. This is a fact which was first forgotten by the general public and is now denied by authoritarian elements. It is nevertheless an extremely important fact, for if our people do not know where their freedom is, some day they will want it in a hurry and will be unable to find it. Among the chief sinners in this regard are Protestants themselves who not only forget that their forefathers established the foundations of minority rights in this country but even go further and deny to a non-Christian minority the privileges of their own universities and colleges. . . .

Jewish names will be found in the indices of every branch of research or learning. Anti-Semitism, acutely conscious of the eminence of Jews in the arts and sciences, would raise against them an academic blockade. If the doors of our colleges and universities could be slammed in their faces, if they could be educationally starved their intellectual life would recede and die. . . .

In Czarist Russia, in Poland, in Rumania, and in other European countries this policy was well known long before the appearance of Fascism. The number of Jewish children was even restricted in elementary schools. Nobody ever dreamed that this miserable quota education would cross the ocean to the land of democracy. But it did. The restriction of Jews from institutions of higher learning is already practiced in many of the better known and in some of the so-called exclusive colleges, especially those which claim to be non-sectarian although they are predominantly Protestant in character and control. . . .

In almost every instance where a Jewish boy or girl, no matter how well qualified by training and character, is denied admission into one or another so-called better known American college of Protestant origin and control no decent excuse is given . . . or can be given. This is an outrage to Jewish youth. And it is a betrayal of Protestant principles by Protestant institutions. This betrayal is highlighted by the fact that Roman Catholic institutions are not guilty. It is a retreat from Americanism. A slight retreat you will say. That is because your boy is not among those excluded. It is the boy outside the closed gate who feels the tragedy. This retreat leads straight to the American counterpart of Hitler's Germany. The blockade against Jewish youth must be broken!

We are mailing this editorial to the presidents of all those institutions which to our knowledge apply discrimination against Jews in their admission of students in the hope that they will reverse this anti-democratic practice.

—Editorial from *The Protestant* (July-August, 1944).

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXX SEPTEMBER, 1944 No. 7

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Some quotations from Minister Joseph Goebbels' speech on the attempted assassination of Hitler on July 20th as published in the New York *Times* (July 27th):

". . . our cause, which is just, and under the protection of God."

"The Fuehrer performs his work under the protection of Providence."

"A Divine Fate ruling over all human life and deeds gives us a hint that this work [of the Fuehrer] is to be completed."

"As for the Fuehrer, he is in God's hands."

"I am firmly convinced that Providence had taken the Fuehrer under its protection in that tragic hour."

"I thank the Almighty that He has taken the Fuehrer into His gracious protection and ask Him to continue to do so."

"The Almighty will never again reveal Himself more distinctly to us than in His miraculous salvation of the Fuehrer."

From all this it would seem that Goebbels is a very religious man and the Nazi cause a very holy cause. If Goebbels is to be trusted—and he seems to know all about it!—God is busy at this moment with nothing quite so much as giving Adolf Hitler proper protection under conditions of exceeding difficulty. But there is nothing particular to boast about in all this. This is what God is doing in all the nations in this war, if their respective spokesmen are to be trusted. These nations, their leaders, their people, their causes—all miraculously enjoy God's favor and protection. Which means, if it means anything, that it is awfully easy to use the name of God! But we wonder if it is quite so easy to understand him, and to have communion with his spirit. Why is there only one Lincoln in the course of centuries who does not claim that God is on his side, but prays that he may be on God's side? That God belongs to all peoples everywhere and is concerned with their welfare, of this we may be sure. But that God helps one people to destroy another, and takes his belligerent part on one side or the other in a ferocious struggle for mutual annihilation, of this we may, in God's mercy, be very, very doubtful. One misreads the Divine Providence when he interprets it in terms of intervention for the single individual, or partisan intervention on behalf of any single nation. God is fighting evil and preserving good wherever they appear, and they appear everywhere. God is loving and pitying all his children, and his children are all mankind. It is frequently the deepest reverence that says the least, and the grossest blasphemy that says the most, about God.

II

News suddenly broke out from India on July 13th last. It was strange news! According to a Reuter's dispatch of this date, Gandhi had suddenly changed his mind on the whole question of dealings with Britain. He had now given up all idea of further resort to civil disobedience during the continuance of the war; he was ready to accept a federal government for India which would leave complete control of the army and of military operations in the hands of the Viceroy and of the British Commander-in-Chief; and, most amazing of all, he was willing to accept the "Pakistan" plan of the Moslem League for the dividing up of India on a religious basis. Our newspapers all took this report seriously—why not, with Reuter's behind it?—and not unnaturally suggested that if Gandhi had had this mind earlier, the Cripps Plan might have been adopted. But to me the report was incredible. I had read such reports before as engineered by the British censorship, and I simply refused to believe what seemed to me to be obviously the latest form of British propaganda. Two weeks later there came a dispatch from the New Delhi correspondent of the New York *Times,* significantly dated "July 31st (delayed)," which told a different story. Gandhi had indeed announced his willingness to abandon civil disobedience, and had denounced underground political and sabotage efforts against British rule, in the interest of Indian support of the war against Japan. But this was one side of a bargain—a concession to the fact that a war is on! On the other side—and note carefully!—was a demand by Gandhi for a guaranty of full independence for India after the war and for increased wartime Indianization of the national government. This last involved a regime in

which Indians would control civil affairs and the British military through a native cabinet responsible to the legislature and not to the Viceroy (rather different from the Reuter account!). As regards "Pakistan," Gandhi had asked to see the Moslem leader, Jinnah, to discuss a formula accepting in principle Moslem autonomy, and providing for a plebiscite of all peoples, in the parts of India in which the Moslems have a majority, on the question of the formation of a separate Mohammedan state (rather different again!). Along with all this went a demand on Gandhi's part for the immediate release of Nehru and other imprisoned Indian leaders. What this all means is that Gandhi was again trying to find agreement with British and Indian Moslems, more particularly union in India, but without sacrifice of his own basic principles or of the one objective of national independence. Is it surprising that Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for India, rejected Gandhi's plan *in toto,* that Viceroy Wavell declined even to receive Gandhi for discussion, and that Ali Jinnah, President of the Moslem League, is opposing Gandhi's proposal for Hindu-Moslem agreement? If there is further trouble in India, it will not be the Mahatma's fault.

III

What has become of President Roosevelt's program for a post-war world order? Given casually to the public in June, it disappeared as suddenly as it was announced. "Its contents made no impression on the people as a whole," says *Common Sense* (July). "Within two days after its announcement, nothing more was said of it in the newspapers or on the air." Was this because the plan was a mere political device for "short-circuiting the Republicans by proposing a plan they would have to support," as the Editor of *Common Sense* suggests? Or was it because the people are tired of peace plans and, in the light of present-day diplomatic developments, more or less skeptical of their sincerity? Or was it because of weaknesses in the President's plan which betrayed at once its certain failure? My own judgment is that this last explanation comes very near the truth. In its essential character, the President's proposal offered nothing new or promising at all. It was "the same old war-horse," said Ely Culbertson, "the old League of Nations with a shiny new ribbon tied on its tail, gold-lettered, 'The League of *United* Nations.'" In its relation to the present world situation, the plan promised no more escape from war than the old Versailles plan which made inevitable another war. This "plan for world security," said Norman Thomas, presidential candidate of the Socialist Party, "if it should be adopted, would make a third world war more certain than the peace of Versailles made the second." What the President recommended was an international organization of the nations, *not* "a superstate with its own police forces and other paraphernalia of coercive power," but an "effective agreement" and accord which will hold the nations together in cooperative action for the common good. This sounds fine—until it is discovered that this union of the nations "would maintain, according to their capacities, adequate forces to meet the needs of preventing war," and that Britain, the United States and Soviet Russia, plus China, would dominate the whole! The function of the Council of the new League would be to provide "peaceful settlement of international disputes and the prevention of threats to the peace," and an international court of justice would be established to help. But this, of course, means simply maintaining the *status quo* after the war in the interest of the three major powers. This is simply "a worse League," to quote Thomas again—"rampant imperialism," to quote Culbertson again. Not by any such enthronement of victor powers over beaten enemies and helpless smaller powers, is peace ever to be won. This Roosevelt peace would last as long as the new balance of power lasted, or the three great nations still agreed among themselves. That would not be long! No wonder the President's plan died a-borning.

IV

Proposals to outlaw by international agreement after this war the pilotless bomb which is now afflicting England, brings to mind the constant and always futile attempts to banish weapons which seem to be incredibly horrible when they first appear. In 1139 the Lateran Council put the newly invented crossbow under a solemn ban. When guns and cannons came into use, there was great indignation among chivalrous soldiers. Fighting up to this new age of bows and muskets had been in the form of hand-to-hand encounters, sword against sword, spear against spear, and here were men striking from a distance and killing their foes without giving them a chance to defend themselves. Doctor Heering, in his recent book, *The Fall of Christianity,* recalls that as late as 1870 a Dutch editor wrote in his paper in pity of soldiers "torn to pieces by a whistling piece of iron, shot from a great distance out of an invisible machine." Mr. Bakeless, in his *The Origin of the Next War,* refers to a Russian general in the last war who vowed to hang every German airman that fell into his hands. "That wasn't fighting!" So now we are horrified, as we should be horrified, at the pilotless bomb, which is the latest development of machine warfare. But horror is going to avail nothing in this case any more than in previous cases of relatively as dreadful horror in earlier eras of history. "The technical war-mind," writes Doctor Heering, "recognizes neither chivalry nor any other moral virtue, caring only for the quality of destructive and terrifying effect. . . It is always advancing, for its ingenuity is inexhaustible and stops at nothing." If a new weapon proves to be effective, then it takes its place in the armament of nations, no matter how horrible it may be. Dumdum bullets, machine guns, submarines, bombing planes, the destruction of open cities—these all have shocked the

world in our time, but they are all now commonplaces of war. If the pilotless bomb proves to be too expensive, too hit-and-miss, then it will pass, like the "Big Bertha" of the last war. But if it proves to be successful because enormously destructive at great range, as seems altogether likely, then not all the protests of all the chorus of mankind will avail anything. Are we never going to learn that as long as we have war, we are going to have weapons of increasing fiendishness of this kind? Are we never going to understand that there is really only one horror, and that is war itself? If humanity is to be saved from ultimate extinction, and unimaginable agonies as it approaches extinction, then it must be not by trying to get rid of this terrible weapon and that, but by resolving to get rid of war. As long as war is tolerated and practiced, so long will the worst of man's diabolical ferocity be upon us. There is no escape from the doom now impending except by the outlawry of war!

V

That was a pertinent question which was asked in the House of Commons the other day. Said Lieut. Col. Thomas Moore, Conservative, "Will the United Nations regard as war criminals those scientists who have been decorated by Hitler for their skill in devising flying bombs?" The question here has nothing to do at the moment with the issue of punishment. Assuming without discussion that war criminals are going to be punished after the war has been won, it is asked if among these criminals should not be included the scientific inventors who have created the fiendish forces with which this war is being fought. Our own answer to this inquiry is, *Why not?* Take the flying bombs as an illustration! Nothing more devilish has been devised since war began. And they were devised by scientists sitting in a laboratory, working coolly, calmly, deliberately, day and night, to perfect this machine for the indiscriminate slaughter of civilians. If any men in this war are to be punished for cruelty, why not these cold-blooded scientists who made possible a death toll of innocents in London to match the death toll of innocents in Nazi concentration camps and before Nazi firing squads? But these flying bombs are not the only instance of this horror. The whole paraphernalia of modern warfare is the product of scientific invention. Every flying fortress, every tank, every submarine, every magnetic mine, every machine gun, every "booby trap," every explosive of ever-increasing destructive potency, goes back to some man, of scientific training and ingenuity, who had a bright idea, and to some group of men, in laboratory and factory, who perfected the idea and thus worked out its most hideous possibilities. What war is today it has been made by the scientific world. It is our colleges, our technical schools, our physical and chemical laboratories, which have done the job. And I say that this is a crime infinitely worse than that of the underling officer who shoots a group of helpless hostages in some occupied village, or even that of the commanding general who plots and plans the wasting of an invaded countryside. What are these scientists thinking about when they labor at these inventions? What was Lake thinking about when he invented the submarine, or that German genius who conceived the mechanism of the flying bomb? Did they have no imagination at all, that they could do such things? I can picture fiends in hell working gleefully over these devices for destroying the human race—but not man! Yet here they are, making war more horrible every hour. If there is any criminality anywhere, this is it. Yet Lieut. Col. Moore's question seemed so startling that it was cabled across the Atlantic!

VI

It is in the good old summertime that I get a fresh dose of the radio, and am smitten anew at the horrid abuse to which this marvelous invention is subjected. The advertising this season seems worse than ever—more salve-y and at the same time more impudent, more platitudinous and repetitious, more utterly contemptuous of every standard of decency and the everlasting fitness of things. Ominous in the extreme is the slow but sure invasion of the highest class programs by this insidious disease of commercial propaganda. "Information, Please," is a program of true cultural interest and appeal, but you cannot listen to it without being thrice insulted by inane talks about Heinz's 57 Varieties. The Boston Symphony Orchestra broadcasts high-grade "Pop" concerts every Saturday night—an hour of charming music, swallowed *in toto,* as a boa constrictor might swallow a rabbit, by the Allis-Chalmers Company, which intersperses its vulgar trade talks between selections by Von Weber, Mendelssohn and Wagner. Even the Town Meeting of the Air has succumbed to the blandishments of advertising, and henceforth will have its superb discussions of public questions of the most serious importance debased by "pep" talks in the interest of its sponsor, *The Reader's Digest.* What wonder that the first announcement of this policy was greeted by the audience with a long and loud outburst of hisses, which carried beautifully over the air! Evidently nothing can be divorced from money-making in this country. Cigarettes, liquors, laxatives, and vitamins must have free access to every influence directed to the mind and heart of the American people. Yet there are limits! Thus, I was enormously interested to note the other day that the advertising on a program of which I was a part was not allowed to intrude into the broadcasting chamber. There we sat before our microphones in utter silence, while the sales talk went out over the air to our millions of listeners from another room. We heard not a word of it. Why? Obviously, because it was thought that the boosting of a commercial product—"go to your

corner drugstore tonight, and buy the small yellow package, only 25 cents"—if heard by the program speakers, might disturb their minds and lower the whole level of their discussion. But if this is true of the speakers—or singers, or players—why not also of the listeners? Is not the whole thing monstrous—that we can enjoy nothing on the radio without having our helpless ears and equally helpless minds assaulted in this gross fashion? The time is coming when this prostitution of the air to the vulgarest commercial interests will be cited as the supreme illustration of the decadence of our materialistic civilization.

Jottings

After the attempt upon his life in late July, Hitler announced to the German people that he would continue to dedicate his life "to worry, work and worry only." I imagine he is right. Henceforth it is "worry" without any question for the German Fuehrer.

Every new weapon of war, from firearms to the robot bomb, has met with condemnation. See *Don Quixote,* volume I, book IV, chapter XI (published 1604 A. D.):

> Blessed be those happy ages that were strangers to the dreadful fury of these devilish instruments of artillery, whose inventor I am satisfied is now in Hell, receiving the reward of his cursed invention, which is the cause that very often a cowardly base hand takes away the life of the bravest gentleman.

And every new weapon of war, from firearms to the robot bomb, once invented, is straightway universally adopted and used. Thus does war grow ever more horrible!

The Vatican has again called for peace now. "Let us hasten peace," it says. "It is the only good on which we can still count." Thus does the Pope maintain his steadfast record as the leading peacemaker of Christendom. Will the world be wise enough to place him at the peace table?

A new volume of Churchill's speeches, *Onwards to Victory,* the fourth since the war began, has recently been published. Here is the great Churchill—the incomparable orator, the brilliant war minister, and the heroic patriot. Would that Churchill were content with these roles, and not eager to become world statesman and peacemaker!

The two noblest men in the two old parties today are Wendell Willkie and Henry Wallace. The Republican Party would have nothing of the one, nor the Democratic Party of the other. If there is any other comment needed on these two aggregations of political gangsters, I cannot think of what it may be.

There are many resolves which must be kept steadfastly to the forefront of attention in the making of the peace. One certainly is that the net result of this war shall not be the substitution of Stalin for Hitler, as the net result of the last war was the substitution of Hitler for the Kaiser. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

And What About Palestine?

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

This is no more a rhetorical question than is the query "What About Minority Peoples?" or "What About the Smaller Nations?" etc. Rather is this an inquiry that relates itself vitally and materially to the whole complex of that tremendous question mark regarding the world of tomorrow. As the military campaigns on the many fronts of our far-flung battle lines continue to develop favorably, and as victory emerges from the mists of hope and dream and assumes increasing clarity of form and outline, plans for the post-war world are becoming more and more the preoccupation of governments and statesmen as well as of the common man. In these plans, the minority peoples, the smaller nations, dare not be considered, as some would have us do, as just another nuisance that must be attended to, as just an incident in a larger scheme, or as just another side issue, but rather as a major problem. Already we are being made conscious of the post-war picture as a map on which the Big Four are to play a dominating role, and many of us are wondering whether this means a repetition of the past era of power politics and of that "Realpolitik" whose lessons we have learned so painfully and at so terrible a price. Will the new world be just another copy of the old world? Will it be the same old place of imperialism and diplomatic chicanery, a world in which the status of the smaller nations is again reduced to that of "you do as we please," the "we" being the Big Brother nations whose primary concern is to cut the loaf and to grab the largest slice, while the "little fellows" are expected to be smilingly satisfied with the crumbs that fall from the tables of the mighty?

The question I have here posed concerns one of these minority peoples, one of these "small nations." For the question of Palestine is, in much more than a partisan Jewish sense, a world question. Irrespective of those voices within or without Jewry that oppose the

program of Zionism, the problem of Palestine as a national home for the Jewish people is today recognized by governments and public opinion alike as a matter that not only must be included among the major items of the peace agenda but also as one that demands a fair and equitable disposition in the larger framework of a reconstructed international order. In other words, the objections of non-Zionists here and there notwithstanding, Palestine *is* an issue, i. e., Palestine as the fulfillment of Israel's dream of the ages, Palestine as the land whose return to the Jews Theodore Herzl (the fortieth anniversary of whose death the Jewish world has just observed) so ardently desired and so effectively prepared.

If the Jews have for so long a time been expatriates and wanderers from Palestine, history tells us very plainly that the fault is not theirs. If ever a people has clung with fierce devotion and fiery zeal to the soil of its fathers, to the land where for centuries it had developed its own culture and civilization, the Jews are such a people. When the Jew for the first time forsook his beloved Eretz Yisroel under the impact of the Babylonian conqueror in 586 B. C., he left not of choice but by compulsion. When after that final revolt against a foreign oppressor, led by the brilliant Bar Kochba in 135 A. D., the Jewish nation lost its independence, the end came not as a surrender by the Jews, not as willing acquiescence before military power and alien domination, but as the tragic result of the assault by a mighty empire on a weaker people. Since then Jews have always lived in Palestine, have always maintained their loyalty and love for the land, and have never dreamed of surrendering their claims to a reconstituted nationhood. If today there are those who say that Palestine should not be returned to the Jews because most Jews neither live there nor ever will live there, the answer is that if similar criteria were applied to other small peoples, the claims of most of them would have to be refused; in that case, Ireland, Greece, Norway, Denmark, etc., should not become free and independent again, since all of their nationals are not likely ever again to make these lands their home. It does seem that whenever the claim of the Jew for equal treatment in the family of nations is made, the reasons that argue for the freedom and independence of others are always readily turned against him. Against the common objection that the Jew has, after all, been away from Palestine so long that any claim to its possession would seem fantastic and unreal, it should be said that a vital people's claim upon independence and homeland is not subject to artificial statutes of limitation arbitrarily imposed by those who are afraid to pay the price called for to right an ancient wrong.

It is also argued that the Jews, having lost their homeland to a stronger power, cannot expect others to recover for them what they themselves are unable either to regain or to hold by force. Are the free and democratic peoples of the world willing to grant the logic of this argument? If such considerations are to prevail, then no weaker nation has the right to call upon the stronger for protection. Then particularly the Arabs, who are today claiming primary rights in Palestine solely on the basis of their conquest of the land almost twelve hundred years ago, have no case, since their lands were retaken from the Turk twenty-seven years ago, not by them but by the armies of one of the allied nations.

And what about the much-mooted argument that world Jewry is today not showing a united front in the cause of Zionism and thereby disqualifies its claims for freedom and independence? If the facts that Jewry is today not completely united on the issue of returning to Palestine and that most Jews could not return there if they would are to militate against the Zionist program, then the cause of many another nation now fighting for liberty and independence, such as Greece, Yugoslavia, India, and even China, to mention only a few, would fall under the same ruling, viz., that a nation does not deserve freedom unless all of its people feel exactly alike in matters of government, religion, economic ideology, etc.

I would answer this outcry against "Jewish disunity" with the simple rejoinder, also applicable to other "disunited" people, viz., that it is their private affair; let them attend to their family quarrels. As regards this much-touted Jewish disunity, it might also be pointed out (1) that the efforts of the Zionist pioneers, who during these past twenty-six years have made of Palestine a real home for more than a million and a half Arabs and Jews, would indicate a sufficient degree of unanimity, if not "unity," of purpose among the Jewish people to argue not only for a continuance of the program of Zionism but also for its intensification and more comprehensive implementation. The past quarter of a century of Zionist history has brought forth flourishing cities out of the dunes and dust of centuries of neglect and inefficiency, has changed a wilderness into a veritable garden, harnessed rivers, created industry and commerce, and generally has produced a miracle of civilization and culture such as history will find it difficult to duplicate anywhere. If this is "disunity," then we can say about it what Lincoln is supposed to have said about the whiskey drinking habit of General Grant. Certainly a people that has the courage, purpose, and vision to create what Zionism has so far produced in Palestine cannot be put off with the easy charge, "you are not sufficiently united"; (2) that the growing interest in Palestine among Jews everywhere proves conclusively that whatever ideological differences may divide the Jews as to the particular form of Palestinian resettlement, they do seem quite definitely united in their demand that somewhere in the picture of the postwar world Palestine as a place of refuge and asylum cannot be denied them; (3) that the world-wide interest which the Jews are showing in the tragedy that has overwhelmed European Jewry proves conclusively that here a degree of unity and unanimity exists which will undoubtedly, if given time and opportunity, express itself in a growing understanding for the place and role of Palestine in the larger program of Jewish relief and rehabilitation. Certainly the demand for the recognition of Palestine as a Jewish homeland is completely in harmony with the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and with the principles of the Four Freedoms. If these are not applicable to the Jewish minority, to whom do they apply?

All of which would seem to add up to these three simple propositions, viz., that the return of Palestine to the Jews as a home where they may continue to develop their particular national culture and live their life as they please, without fear of aggression and outside interference, is properly and legitimately demanded in the name of justice, of national honor, and of human decency. When I say "in the name of justice," I am not thinking in terms of "absolute justice." In fact, as regards absolute justice, I would quote the homely words

of that startled rustic who upon seeing a giraffe for the first time is supposed to have exclaimed, "No Sir, thar aint no sich animal!" When the claim of the Jews upon Palestine encounters the ready-made objection that this would involve some apparent injustice to others and that such an arrangement would violate the demands of absolute justice, my blunt retort is "so what?" Will any one of these objectors, so ready with quotation and proof-text from his pet holy book, kindly inform me, or anyone else, for that matter, how and where at any time in history the conflicting claims among peoples and nations have been adjudicated or adjusted upon a basis of "absolute justice"? Will anyone venture to say that the reshaping of the European and Asiatic maps after World War I was accomplished on such a basis, or that with the best intentions of all involved they might have been so adjusted? Where the claims and counter claims of conflicting national and cultural groups were involved, were in any case final arrangements arrived at that satisfied all and left no bitter feelings and resentments? Any such suggestion can come only from blinded idealists or from impractical advocates of counsels of perfection; but they have no place in a world of reality and of hard political and economic facts, nor have they the authority of either justice or common sense in this particular situation where the just claims of the Jew are to be sacrificed by a sacrosanct prejudice to the much less just claims of the Arabs.

In the case of the Jewish claim upon Palestine, the "injustice" of which the non-Jewish, especially the Christian, world today seems so terribly afraid, would appear insignificant and trifling in comparison with the much more obvious "injustices" that the world greeted as common sense and political wisdom twenty-five years ago. Or is it really so hard to contemplate that a million or more Arabs would ultimately have to live under a democratic, free, and progressive Jewish government while it has seemed quite just to have millions of Jews live for centuries among peoples where at no time their lot has been more than relatively secure and usually precarious? Or is the thought of an "Arabian irridenta" so much more intolerable than that of placing Germans under Polish or Russian rule, or Poles under Russian rule, or letting the people of India continue under an unwanted British imperialism, or for that matter to have any other minority group assigned its home under "alien" rule? All of this will be done, has been done, and in a world of reality seems inevitable. Why this sudden hysteria about making a similar arrangement in favor of the Jewish people, many of whom would under the most feasible arrangement in Palestine still have little choice as regards their "national home"? Will *any* "correction" or redrawing of national boundaries, whether in Europe or Asia or anywhere else, ever be possible without doing violence and hurt to the feelings of some people? Then why this sudden, and I suspect fundamentally hypocritical, concern for the Arabs of Palestine?

I want the Arabs included in any fair and just reconstruction of the post-war world. Who does not? To say that the Jews are intent upon "robbing" the Arab, of laying the yoke of foreign oppression and alien tyranny upon his neck, of exploiting him and of destroying his freedom and independence, is to indulge in just another version of that type of Nazi and anti-Semitic slander to which Adolf Hitler and his vociferous Minister of Propaganda and Enlightenment have accustomed us. Are we going to "fall for it"? The Balfour Declaration, in plain and straightforward language, provides for the protection of the racial and religious minorities in Palestine. No intelligent Jew, and surely no responsible Zionist, would have it otherwise. In fact, I question whether the Arab-Jewish conflict, which on several occasions has flared up under the British Mandate in Palestine, would ever have reached that deplorable climax of riot and bloodshed had the adjustment of the relationship between these two groups been left to the wise and intelligent leadership of Arab and Jew; and to say that such leadership does not exist, either among Arabs or Jews, is to add insult to injury. Among those who know, there is common agreement to the effect that if Arabs and Jews had been left to their own resources in the attempt to settle their differences without outside interference and harassment, the whole picture in Palestine would today be a much more peaceful and quiet one. One of the great difficulties in this difficult situation has been the fact that the Mandatory Power, i. e., Great Britain, which had been assigned the role of umpire in this case, has at almost every turn of events shown a tendency to arrogate to itself privileges and powers not inherent in the actual role of the mandate as intended by the League of Nations. Great Britain as umpire has not been satisfied to "call the plays" but has insisted on "making" them, with the result that confusion became worse confounded and a situation arose which, to remain in our sports metaphor, is neither good cricket nor fair baseball.

Moreover, when we speak of the "justice" of the Jewish demand for Palestine, we are speaking of "just claims" so old and ancient that their very age makes most people inclined to wave them aside as meaningless. But I repeat that the claims of a people for liberty and independence are not subject to a statute of limitations. This applies with all the logic of history to the matter of Palestine. If the Arabs today maintain that they have for more than twelve centuries occupied Palestine and enjoyed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness there all this time, with the exception of the few centuries under Turkish rule, the Jew can say with even stronger persuasion that he occupied the land more than three thousand years ago, that he built a great culture and civilization there, and that he never voluntarily surrendered his rights there. If twelve hundred years of possession, interrupted by only a few centuries of forcible dispossession, make a good case for the Arab in Palestine, then what about the case of the Jew? Does it not appear that the cause of justice as involved in the Jew's claims for Palestine is much stronger than the case of the Arabs if only on the basis of history and morality? Let us consider (1) that the Arab has land and to spare, and that the outcry against Zionism as a movement designed to "rob" the poor Arab is as untrue as it is in bad taste; and particularly in bad taste in view of the fact, corroborated by history, that the Arab has not only frightfully neglected Palestine but has shown himself similarly inefficient in, and indifferent to, the development of other vast territories he possesses; (2) that the Arab could spare not only the area of present Palestine, but Transjordania and much more, before his movements and life would in any manner be hampered or his style "cramped"; (3) that the Arab is today nowhere persecuted or abused as his Semitic cousins, the Jews, have been for all these centuries; and that previous centuries have disclosed that Arab and Jew *can* live in close fellowship and cooperation and that such political, commercial, and cultural relationship has never been disturbed by Jewish fanaticism and ag-

gression but rather by Arab intolerance, only too often stemming from the dogmatism and fanaticism native to the Moslem mind; (4) that if large groups of Moslems, Arab and others, are to live under so-called "alien" rule, why would it be so unjust and inhuman to ask a small percentage of the world's Arabs to live under Jewish rule? Is it likely that a Jewish national government would vent its anger on the Arabs, that it would violate a fundamental provision of its original charter of liberty, the Balfour Declaration, by persecuting a people which racially and religiously is related to Jewry? The Arabs are not likely to do much to throw off the "foreign yoke" of the British Mandate; are we to assume that if wise and responsible leaders came to an agreement, the Arabs of Palestine would *not* find it equally tolerable, if not much more pleasant and comfortable, to live under Jewish rule, particularly since we have every reason to believe that an independent Palestinian Commonwealth would become an experiment in practical democracy such as history has not known; (5) that over against all the claims of the Arabs there stands the stark fact of Jewish experience: a homeless people, deprived of land and freedom through no fault of its own except that it was too weak to meet and defeat the aggressor. This people today asks not for enough land to house and shelter all Jews, it asks for only a pitifully small corner, for only a few crumbs of the earth's riches, and it gives the assurance that it will develop this land, husband its resources, treasure its shrines, and protect its many scenes and places dear to hundreds of millions of religious folk everywhere. It asks not for something to which it has no claim; it asks only that a part of its ancient heritage be returned and that a small percentage of its people, now living in a world-wide dispersion, be allowed to return "home," not to be "re-ghettoized," but to live as freemen where once their fathers lived and where their bodies and souls may find security and peace. These are only a few of the considerations prompted in the name of "justice." Let me now speak in the name of "national honor."

Not only Great Britain, the mandatory power, but also the United States is deeply involved in the pledge to return Palestine to the Jews as a national homeland. The former, not only on the basis of the unequivocal commitments made in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 but also by virtue of the trust reposed in the government of the British Empire by those more than fifty member nations of the League of Nations that in 1922 voted Great Britain the mandate over Palestine; the latter stands similarly committed by reason of the unanimous congressional resolution on behalf of Palestine passed that same summer. These actions by two of the world's greatest powers cannot be lightly waved aside, nor can the repeated statements and resolutions issued since the outbreak of World War II by the United Nations or the frequent declarations made in England and America by leaders in government, education, business, and religion be considered as "sound and fury signifying nothing," unless we are to assume that the words of nations, great and small, have neither honor nor conscience behind them. Unless these frequent expressions of deep concern for world Jewry in general and for the Zionist program in particular, expressions so completely in tune with every high principle of justice and democracy voiced in the Atlantic Charter and in the Four Freedoms, are to remain just so much empty oratory, unless they are no more than "tinkling bell and clanging cymbal," they must be implemented and activated in consonance with those high considerations of national honor and national integrity that appeared to have motivated them when first uttered. Moreover, these promises and guaranties given the Jewish people were made by statesmen and political leaders who claim to be "Christians," and they were endorsed and given added force by the church and by men and women of high moral principles in every walk of life. It is not saying too much to declare dogmatically that the Christian nations have given to world Jewry "a word of honor" so explicit and so clear that any evasion or subterfuge, whether employed in the name of military expediency, of economic opportunism, or of political "realism," will constitute nothing more or less than treachery, dishonor, the betrayal of a sacred trust, and the criminal violation of a holy pledge. Never before in all history have the nations of the world that call themselves lovers of freedom, protectors of democratic rights, and defenders of religion committed themselves so definitely to a course of action that any deviation therefrom will carry with it the most terrific indictment that has ever been levelled against civilized peoples. It is nothing short of shocking therefore to have a prelate in high position declare bluntly that the plighted word of his government is to be interpreted, not in keeping with its obvious intent, but in the spirit of that appeasement and diplomatic chicanery which even today are making decent people everywhere fearful lest we are again to see duplicity and hypocrisy, instead of honor and straightforwardness, determine the intercourse of nations and decide the fate of smaller peoples. The question is not whether the disposition of Palestine in keeping with the pledge of the Balfour Declaration or the resolution of the United States Congress or the repeated commitments of the United Nations will "solve" the Jewish problem. Granted that the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine will only be a beginning towards that larger solution, to which, incidentally, our war aims are dedicated, the important point to remember is this: the United Nations have recognized the right of the Jew to return to Palestine, to develop there his own national life, and to build there a "home" for Jewish culture and existence on the basis of that guaranty of self-determination and independence to smaller nations and minority peoples that plays so important a role in every post-war scheme for world reconstruction. To this end they, the United Nations, have pledged their sacred honor, and again I ask: Are all other people to be the beneficiaries of this pledge except the Jew? All of this grants the tremendous complexity of the problem, its many ramifications and side issues, but these difficulties cannot excuse either injustice or dishonor on the part of those who would have the world believe that this war is being fought in order to establish the life of *all* peoples on a "just and honorable basis." The difficulties of the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine may be many and serious; they are no more nor more serious than the difficulties facing the victors in this war in countless other areas of the world. Wherever peace is to result in some measure of freedom and democratic privilege for peoples, it will come as the result of honorable dealings between honorable people. Is there *one* reason consistent with either honor or justice that dare be invoked *against* the Jews and their claims on Palestine?

And finally, the question of Palestine and the Jews is one of simple human decency, or shall I say of "religion"? At the very heart of all high religion there lies the recognition of Human Brotherhood which inter-

preted in its simplest terms means the recognition that "all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." In this matter we are not dealing with the case of a people crying and reaching for the moon or demanding special privilege and particular attention. The yearning for Palestine does not arise from the petulant or stubborn desire of a people that wants something it neither should nor can have. Never was the cry "let us return to our homeland" coming from a great people raised with more justice, historic authority, and humane implications. The demand of the World Zionist Organization for the abrogation of the White Paper of 1939, for unrestricted immigration into the Holy Land, and for the implementation of past promises and assurances should win the wholehearted support of every decent human being that has imagination and understanding for the terrible plight of millions of his Jewish fellow men.

Despite the ravings of Fascist- and Nazi-minded anti-Semites and Judaeophobes, the question of reopening Palestine to unresricted immigration may well be kept on the high plane of realism as well as that of justice, honor, and humanitarian interest. The problem of the absorptive capacity of Palestine, e. g., has been authoritatively and convincingly handled in Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk's little book, *Palestine, Land of Promise.* All other problems associated with the continuance of the Zionist experiment there, so hopefully begun and so brilliantly carried through twenty-six difficult years, can be settled as any other pre-eminently "human" problem can be settled if men will bring to its solution integrity, wisdom, patience, and a love of their fellow man. Today the question of Palestine cries for solution on this basis; it demands that something be done at once and effectively to assure those hosts of persecuted and expatriated Jews that their fate is not a matter of indifference to those people who are claiming to wage a world war for the liberty, equality, and security of ALL; it demands that old promises be fulfilled, that bonded words be transmuted into honorable action; it demands that once for all in their dealings with a small nation, with a minority people, the "Christian" nations and those associated with them in the great crusade for freedom act promptly, honorably, and heroically to redeem their sacred pledge and to accept the high responsibility of their repeated declaration and confession of faith.

The only answer to the question, "And What About Palestine?", consistent with the high professions of the United Nations, with their proud pronouncements in the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms, in tune with the political faith they hold, and in keeping with the spirit of the religion of Jesus of Nazareth, is one of bold action, of immediate and daring steps to activate those principles of justice and equality that apply particularly to the Jewish people and to their claim on Palestine. While pity is not enough, while compassion will not suffice, these and all kindred emotions of fellowship and brotherhood may well serve to supply that emotional fire and that inspiration without which the sterner demands of justice cannot capture the imagination of men.

The time to answer our question in terms of deeds, not words, is *now.* Neither military expediency nor diplomatic niceties need interfere with a program whose purpose is the saving of the lives of millions, the rebuilding of a great people's homeland, and the righting of the wrong of centuries.

Do Unitarians Worship?

ALFRED STIERNOTTE

I presume that many of our friends passing in front of our church wonder what a Unitarian church is all about. If they look for our Sunday notices on the church page, they find us among the emotional and revivalist sects, but if they inquired as to what our beliefs are, they might be told erroneously that we are a kind of agnostic church where social and political discussions are given under the guise of sermons. They might then feel that we are in a sense a current events society, or a social club, and not, in any strict sense of the word, a church. And these inquisitive friends of ours would be bound to wonder suspiciously: Do these Unitarians worship?

Misunderstanding of the Unitarian position is not confined to those who know little about us; it is also found among eminent scholars who know our history and our philosophy. For instance, Dr. Joseph Fletcher, an Episcopal minister of Cincinnati, and Dean of the Graduate School of Applied Religion, and a man for whose social knowledge and ideals I have the highest regard, remarked to me rather jokingly that "Unitarianism is a flirtation with religion." The accusation, even though it was spoken in a jovial mood, has remained with me ever since, for I know that many of our leaders, past and present, have suffered for their faith. They have been burned at the stake, put in prison, or endured social ostracism, and in no sense could be thought of as flirting with religion. We may presume, however, that many of our friends think that we are merely flirting or amusing ourselves with religion, that we play at singing hymns, or play at praying, and finally play at worship.

In order to dispel these doubts in the minds of those who ignore who and what we are, and also in order to assure ourselves of the meaning of worship for free spirits, it is well for us to consider the problem: Do Unitarians Worship?

If we were to tell the story of man's worship, of the many methods, and of the various buildings used for that purpose, of the sacred words and creeds repeated, it would be a long story filling many libraries. Dr. Robert James Hutcheon, late Professor of the Psychology and Philosophy of Religion, in the Meadville Theological School, in his book, *Frankness in Religion,* lists the multifarious paraphernalia of worship:

> Candles, bells, holy water, vestments, holy oils, the rosary, the scapulars and incense; the missal, the breviary, the ritual and the litanies; the mass, the sacraments and the prayer-wheel; the holy places and the holy days; the religious buildings such as temples, basilicas, cathedrals, pagodas, mosques, churches and chapels; religious sculpture, painting, poetry, music and the decorative arts; bloody animal-sacrifices, fruit-offerings and the communal eating of sacred food; pilgrimages, processions and festivals; the reading of sacred scriptures, the recitation of creeds, formulas and prayers, the chanting of psalms and the singing of hymns; acts and postures such as kneeling, clasping the hands, bowing the head, prostration of the whole body, obscene rites, wild dancing, fasts, abstinence,

painful self-torture—each one of these groups of the phenomena of worship could be illustrated by a close student of the history of religions so fully that the reader would ere long become weary of the recitation.

Yes, it would indeed be a long story to tell of the development of the forms of worship in all churches and in all religions. One of my friends has made a specialty of the many forms of ritual and prayers and litanies as used by churches, ancient and modern, and he tells me he has a whole library on the subject.

Our own reaction to the long list of objects and ceremonials of worship as given by Doctor Hutcheon would be that we are little concerned with them. We are modern people, and what have we to do with ancient sacrifices, pilgrimages, burnt offerings, and kneeling before sacred statues? Many of our good people would say: "If that is worship, we shall have none of it!" Many of you would feel much more inclined to enjoy the open air, to walk or ride in the beauty of the morning sun, or to sit with some friend under the peaceful influence of a lovely night, and call this worship. In fact, a young lady active a few years ago in the social problems circle of this church, told me quite frankly—and I liked her frankness—that she had not come to church at all this spring and summer because she preferred to go cycling on Sunday morning. No doubt she preferred to enjoy the relaxation and the release of a Sunday morning in the country after a week of hurried toil. There is no doubt that the pressure of work, the ceaseless contacts of the week, the nervous energy spent over small details, urge not merely this young lady, but many other people as well, to either go out and commune with the god of the open air on Sunday morning, or to commune with the god Morpheus and sleep through it all! A very charming Icelandic lady burdened with twelve children told me that Sunday is the only day she has in which to rest, "and the good Lord simply would not want me to come to church Sunday morning!"

To be free from the hurried and harried life of the week through the healing touch of communion with nature still appeals to modern man. Communing with nature may then be called man's oldest and man's most recent sense of worship. It is to many of our people, whether they come to church or not, the ground of their sense of worship. We all know the joy of climbing a mountain peak and of feeling our soul expanding by the sight of peak upon peak, and valleys and villages lying at our feet like miniature cities built by children. We all know the healing infection of nature's lovely nights as the placid waters calmly reflect the stars one by one as they appear in the evening sky. It is easy then to feel a part of nature, to commune with nature, and in that communion to be renewed, to be strengthened, and to face our duties with courage and perseverance. Edna St. Vincent Millay has so well expressed the breathless joy of this sense of oneness with nature:

O World, I cannot hold thee close enough!
  Thy winds, thy wide grey skies!
  Thy mists, that roll and rise!
Thy woods, this autumn day, that ache and sag
And all but cry with color! That gaunt crag
To crush! To lift the lean of that black bluff!
World, World, I cannot get thee close enough!

Long have I known a glory in it all.
  But never knew I this:
  Here such a passion is
As stretcheth me apart,—Lord, I do fear
Thou'st made the world too beautiful this year;
My soul is all but out of me,—let fall
No burning leaf; prithee, let no bird call.

The sense of wonder, of exaltation, even of passion in the presence of nature is what we have all experienced in moments of ecstasy, and in those moments we were very close to the experience of worship. We should have little quarrel, therefore, with those of our friends who go to the church of the open air, who find spiritual renewal, the inflowing of new energies from contact with nature. It is indeed a major aspect of worship.

Worship, then, has to do with the joy of the mind, the exaltation of the soul when the petty trials of our daily life are forgotten, and we feel gripped by a reality which is more than we are, a reality which eludes our grasp, and yet flows into us, adds value to our life, and lifts us up to a higher level of being, a richer experience of living. That indeed is worship, and, as we saw, one of the many forms of worship is that of communion with nature.

But is this the only form of worship? Are there not other forms as well? Is nature the only source of this exaltation? Have human beings no part in this uplift? Yes, human personalities, outstanding men who were artists in the art of living are also able to give the sense of renewal and enrichment of which we spoke. And again, I am quite willing to admit that you may get this sense of worship out of the church as well as in the church. Wherever you have felt exalted above the common round of existence, wherever some great soul has moved you and you have felt the presence of this soul as a supreme gift, you have been close to worship.

This sense of worship may arise among people who would never dream of going to church. For instance, I happen to know a woman who, in her youth, was a Sunday school teacher in the Church of England, but for some reason best known to herself, she found a larger spiritual life in the socialist movement. She tells me frankly that Socialism is her religion, and that to go to Victoria when the House is in session and to work among the leaders of her party is a renewing experience for her. She feels, rightly or wrongly—but I am inclined to think rightly, that here is a throbbing life in touch with social realities which complacent people are apt to forget, a throbbing life of devotion which is inspired by the desire to improve conditions for all the people. And this woman has found in a socialist leader a man who incarnates all her ideal and social values. I know this man too, and I can see how his genial temper, his jovial and generous spirit, never frayed by disappointment or failure, do represent for her the excellency of the human spirit in the face of adversity, the indomitable will of man struggling to achieve his values. And this woman would be very much surprised to know that in spite of all her denials of religion, her utter contempt for churches, she is still very religious, and that her idealization of socialist leaders verges on the sense of worship.

The meaning of worship, then, is to be found among those experiences of life which come to us as a gift from some spiritual reality—call it Nature, or call it God—a gift which has overwhelmed us so that we are moved to say: I, unworthy as I am, am privileged to enjoy this larger life; I am given an exaltation of the spirit which fills me with awe, dispels my doubts, fears and trials in an assurance of trust and confidence. We are both judged and supported by this experience. We are judged for our unworthiness, and yet we are supported by a reality "in which we live, move, and have our being."

This is essentially the psychological experience of worship. To be seized at the very center of our being, to be gripped by the larger creative aspects of existence, to be infused with a fresh sense of the beauty and wonder of life—this is worship. I do not care for the moment what a man's political views are; what is his theology or his sociology. Even if he is the most radical person, he will endure moments of despondency, moments of despair, when he will be compelled to look into himself and to call to his resources all his latent energies, and to ask himself the most searching questions: Where do I stand in this vision of a new life for man and for society? Where do I stand in this cosmic pattern of creative processes, in this whole dialectical pattern of the emergence of mind and spirit from nature? Where shall I turn to gather new resolution and courage to attack once more the problems of my life? And I feel quite certain that such a man, even if he had never set foot inside a church, would hunger for the peace, quietness, renewal, and power of the experience of worship.

The question, "Do Unitarians Worship?" should then be answered in the affirmative. Yes, we do worship! We do not come to church in order that the church as such will give us some magical sense of worship. On the contrary, we have experienced moments of worship ourselves through contact with nature, or through the communion of friends, or the exaltation of love. We remember the occasions when we were moved more than we can say by such experiences, and we know that our souls were then in touch with the creative and healing and directive forces of the universe. This is precisely what Dr. Von Ogden Vogt, an authority on free worship, has set forth, at greater length and with much more profundity than I could ever do, as the recollection of life.

We come to church, therefore, in order to recall, to recreate for ourselves the experiences of worship which we already have enjoyed. We wish by means of modern methods and symbolism, to re-enact, to live over again, to recreate for ourselves the drama of our inner life. In all of us, because of our character as human beings, there takes place this drama of the inner life, this change from despair to hope, from despondency to exaltation, from sadness to joy, and finally from weakness to power. This is the dramatic quality of the inner life, this strength of the human spirit which we experience and recreate for ourselves in a religious service. And, therefore, this liberal church of ours should be the society, the structure, the building, the temple where we are proud to house Sunday after Sunday this recreation of our spirits, this renewal and strengthening of our lives. We do want power and control over our own life. And the final function of our free worship is to give us this power by calling to our minds the experiences of beauty, of wonder, of fulfillment, of joy, of victory, and of ecstasy, so that we too are part of this beauty, of this fulfillment, and of this victory. This is our free worship.

In this worship, however, we do not meet as isolated worshippers, each deriving his inner individuality apart from the rest of us. We commune, not merely with nature, or with the great men and prophets of the past, but also with ourselves. We know unconsciously, though we may feel a proper reserve about telling it openly, that we all have experienced this drama, this recreation of the inner life. We are not alone in our sense of unworthiness, nor are we alone in our mood of exaltation. We feel a sacred kinship that we are all part of the one group of worshippers who need from Sunday to Sunday this recreation. And because this recreation goes to the depths of our being, and rises to the heights of our spirit, then this group of worshippers which we are becomes more than a group,—it becomes a fellowship, it becomes a communion knit in bonds which are far deeper than bonds of merely theological, intellectual, or political agreement. This, then, is the nature of our free worship.

The Free Mind Is Practical

RANDALL S. HILTON

In the May issue of UNITY I raised the question: Is the Free Mind Practical? It was indicated there that it could be if it had purpose and direction but that as it is now operative within the liberal movement, particularly within the Unitarian movement, it is not only impractical but chaotic. In this article I want to take the affirmative and point out how the Free Mind Principle can achieve direction and purpose, and that it is practical.

Nothing is achieved without working for it and nothing can be purchased without paying the price. The price for acquiring purpose and direction for the Principle of the Free Mind is the giving up of some cherished traditional concepts and the acceptance of a democratic, scientific discipline. We have been dominated too long by medieval and modern dualisms. Although there are few liberals who still cling to the dualism of the natural and the supernatural, there still is a wide acceptance of the dualism that divides the scientific from the ethical and moral.

It has been assumed that science is definite and definitive, while the field of ethics and morality is relative; that inquiry and experimentation can only be applied to the inanimate, while revelation and intuition must be applied to human relations. Anyone who has kept abreast of the developments of science during the past few decades, who has even a cursory acquaintance with Einstein or Whitehead, knows that science is becoming more and more relativistic. Even the so-called material realm of nature seems to produce more and more variables. But this has not caused the scientist to throw out his method. Instead, by further inquiry and experimentation he is constantly refining and correcting it.

It is this self-correcting inquiry of experimental science,* which is the essence of the scientific method, that offers us the discipline that will make possible the achieving of purpose and direction for the Free Mind Principle. It provides a basis for a genuine hope for improvement in human relations and society.

*See "Ethical Objectivity through Science," by Horace S. Fries, in *The Philosophical Review* (November, 1943), p. 557, ". . . where the self refers not to the scientist but to the abstract, instrumental material of science."

The experimental scientist is always trying to improve his tools, that is, the techniques of relationships between the materials of science. The engineer utilizes these tools for the solving of specific problems in the creation of things for use. Utilizing the experience of the past and present, the scientist collects his facts, arranges them and studies their relationships in the light of a particular hypothesis. The answer is seldom automatic. He may have to change the relationships, or search for additional facts, or revise his hypothesis. However, since his hypothesis is not an Absolute, this does not deter him. He expects his inquiries to correct errors in his hypothesis, his understanding of relationships, and his comprehension of facts.

The same method of self-correcting inquiry can be used in the realm of human relations. That the nature of the facts, the relationships, and the hypotheses will be different is true, as it is true in astronomy, biology, chemistry, physics, etc. But the basic method is still valid, the method of self-correcting inquiry and experimentation. Consciously chosen aims or goals take the place of hypotheses. The use of reason can result in the control of relationships. Existing facts today may or may not be facts tomorrow.

This immediately indicates another price that must be paid—the giving up of any concept of an Absolute Reality. The acceptance or establishment of an Absolute in the realm of the social sciences, ethics, or morality would be and is just as disastrous as in the physical sciences. An Absolute in any realm either prevents or seriously limits freedom of inquiry.

Men who genuinely adhere to the Principle of the Free Mind may find themselves a part of a confused and chaotic company today, but, if they are sincere, they will welcome the opportunity to adopt a method which will put order and purpose into their thinking and planning.

The use of the method of self-correcting inquiry in the fields of ethics, morality, social planning, and social engineering will greatly increase the general acceptance of social responsibility and the control of technological advancement for the betterment of society. It is gratifying today to find an increasing number of scientists and religious leaders recognizing their interdependence and responsibility, for as this group enlarges it also will make possible the expansion of the experimental and democratic processes from the political to the religious, economic, and social phases of life.

It is increasingly apparent, as has been shown by John Dewey, Horace Fries, Max Otto, and others, that the experimental method of self-correcting inquiry is both essential to democracy and dependent upon it when this method is applied to human relations. Men want to feel a part of the procedures, plans, and programs which affect their lives. This is not a new idea to free men but the extent to which they are willing to share this process with others depends upon whether their minds are free *from* traditional absolutes and selfish interests, and whether they are free *for* seeking the improvement of the common welfare of all men.

Applied to our Unitarian Movement this will mean that our ministers, denominational officials, local, regional, and national church leaders, both lay and clerical, cannot operate as heads of corporations only, but will have to function as leaders of inquiry for the purpose of joint planning and carrying out of programs. It will mean that Parish Committees, Boards of Trustees, and Boards of Directors will be more than "business" counselors, and will concern themselves with the over-all aims and objectives of a liberal religious organization. It will mean that both officials and boards will have to discover ways and means of ascertaining the desires and goals of the rank and file. It will mean the actual adoption of democratic and experimental procedures in determining the aims, purposes, and activities of churches, conferences, and associations, in every realm of their functioning.

This is not easy. It means hard work, constant planning and re-planning, continuous self-analysis, self-criticism, and self-correcting inquiry. But it is worth the price and the effort.

Those who have accepted this method know that it has put purpose and direction into their thinking and actions. For them the Free Mind Principle is practical. They do not claim all the answers. It does expand the unknown and increases the majesty and mystery of the universe, of which man is an integral part. There is no fear of the unknown. Instead, there is reverence for the grandeur and beauty of all nature, and there is confidence and faith in the possibility of man and his progress.

The Study Table

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

MUST MEN HATE? *By Sigmund Livingston. New York: Harper & Brothers. 344 pp. $2.50.*

It is a terrible indictment of our civilization, and of the age in which we live, that we have to have books like this. But since such volumes are necessary, we can rejoice that this is so excellent a piece of work.

Mr. Livingston's book is a study of prejudice, very particularly prejudice against the Jew. In its essential character and main purpose it is an attack upon anti-Semitism, or rather an exposé of this wicked mania. Here are all the facts pertaining to this horror—the history of the Jew, the baseless but nonetheless widespread charges against him, the myths, the hoaxes, the forgeries, the miserable appeals to prejudice and passion! Above all, the religious superstitions that have run rampant in ages gone by and still are rife among us. Along with this is a vindication of the Jewish people, and a detailed presentation of their priceless contribution to our Western culture and our American life. The material is handled soberly, sanely, and persuasively. The documentation is remarkable. There is a finality in the argument which is impressive, and which must bring conviction to any mind which has not been poisoned by the conscious and unconscious influences which are systematically analyzed in these pages.

Conspicuous in the book is a lengthy chapter on

"other mass hatreds" which have disgraced our Western life. Among those listed as the victims of cruel persecution are the Huguenots in 16th and 17th century France, the Quakers in England and America, the Mennonites, the Anabaptists, the Waldenses, the Shakers, the Puritans, and especially the Roman Catholics. "Perhaps no religious group has ever encountered more hostility and bitterness in the United States," says Mr. Livingston (page 175), "than the Catholic Church."

The author's presentation of causes and cures—"correctives," as he calls them—is cogent but by no means complete. His book is nonetheless admirable just as it stands, and should be widely read.

◇ ◇ ◇

PRESIDENTIAL AGENT. *By Upton Sinclair. New York: The Viking Press. 655 pp. $3.00.*

The Lanny Budd stories are as fascinating as ever. Indeed, in this fifth volume in the Pulitzer Prize series, they seem to take on an added fascination, for Lanny, in his contact with world events, is now not only the friend of Hitler and Goering, but at the same time the secret agent of President Roosevelt. This places him in the midst of scenes at Washington and Hyde Park as well as at Berlin and Berchtesgaten which carry one into the full sweep of the history leading up to this war. It is all done in this book with the naturalness and ease and absorbing interest which have characterized the entire work from the beginning. It is a masterpiece of its kind.

To understand and appreciate the Lanny series of stories, one must know what Upton Sinclair is doing. Some of the critics seem mystified, but it is all perfectly plain. He is using the medium of the historical novel, and bringing it up to date—i.e., into our own times. The historical novel as conceived and glorified by Walter Scott has a form as definite as that of a Shakespearean play. The author chooses a certain period of history; he takes a young man as his hero, and places him at strategic places in this period; then he carries him through a series of events which, while fictitious, are immersed in the real and memorable events of the period in question. The historical novel is ordinarily placed in a period fairly remote in time and therefore picturesque in character. Thus, Scott's *The Talisman* is laid in Palestine in the Third Crusade. His *Quentin Durward* is laid in France during the reign of Louis XI. Charles Dickens' *The Tale of Two Cities* has to do with the French Revolution, Bulwer Lytton's *The Last Days of Pompeii* with Roman days, and Margaret Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind* with the American Civil War. The purpose of the historical novel is of course to tell a good tale, but also to bring to life the real characters and events of history.

Now Sinclair, in his Lanny Budd books, is writing an extended historical novel, and has had the original idea of placing his story not in some ancient time but in our own contemporary time. After all, today is history as well as yesterday—why not? So Sinclair chose his hero, placed him as a youth in the pre-war years leading up to 1914, gave him family connections in Europe and the United States, provided him with close friends in England and Germany, made him likable, worldly, courageous, shrewd, and then turned him loose in this age of wars and interims between wars. Volume after volume has carried the young man down through these terrific years, all of which he sees and a part of which he is. This present volume takes him into the year 1937, and thus brings him close to the outbreak of the second world war. Critics have complained that Lanny is a Johnny-on-the-spot who witnesses every great event and knows every great personage of the period. But this is what the hero of an historical novel is for! Quentin Durward, in Scott's great romance, is a Scottish youngster who arrives unknown in France, only to become the confidant of the King, Louis XI, and to play an important role in the great drama of the King's long struggle against Charles of Burgundy. In *The Fortunes of Nigel,* young Nigel comes unknown to London, and before he gets through is having personal conferences with the English King, James I. So with Lanny Budd—he knows everybody from Roosevelt on the one side to Hitler on the other, and is invariably present when great events take place! But all this is true to type, and therefore as it should be. If there is anything different, it is that Upton Sinclair has made his hero more plausible than the ordinary hero of historical adventure.

In this latest volume, history bulks somewhat larger than story. It is true that, in Lanny's attempt to rescue his wife from the clutches of the Gestapo, the author has written the most exciting narrative that ever came from his pen—a flawless detective and mystery tale. But on the whole, it is the current of public events which we follow rather than that of the plot of fiction. This is natural enough, as we now know well all the characters in the story, and the period is one in which all personal experiences are inevitably being swallowed up by the stupendous history of this age. Sinclair fits together fiction and fact with an ingenuity which is a marvel of narrative composition, and with a sense of excitement which never flags. Also, he interprets our age and characterizes its leading personalities with extraordinary skill. The Lanny books can go on forever, so far as I am concerned. I shall read them all!

◇ ◇ ◇

THE BHAGAVAD GITA. *A New Translation by Swami Nikhilananda. New York: Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Center, 17 East 94th Street. 386 pp. $3.00.*

THE SAME. *Pocket Edition, bound in red and embellished with gold. 266 pp. $2.00.*

These two volumes present in different form the same text, translated from the Sanskrit, of the great Hindu scripture of India. The first is a book for the library, containing, in addition to the text of the sacred poem, a Foreword by Professor William Ernest Hocking, of Harvard; an Introduction by Swami Nikhilananda and another by Sankaracharya; an elaborate analysis of the story of the Mahabharata, of which the Gita is a part; a Glossary; and an Index. The second volume is smaller, both in form and content, intended to be slipped into the pocket for casual reading at unoccupied moments. It is a beautiful little volume, containing the full text, a Glossary, and a somewhat simpler Introduction by the translator.

The Bhagavad Gita is one of the great scriptures of the world. It not only contains the pure essence of the mystic soul of India, but is an immortal expression of the spiritual reality of life. In a poem of infinite beauty and intensely dramatic setting is set forth the sublime truth of God and of the relation of man to God in

terms of duty unselfishly performed for the Divine. Our rigorous discharge of duty is a discipline which brings man purity of heart and liberation from all the debasing entanglements of the world. To know God, and to serve him without question of motive or consequence is to find strength and peace of mind. *The Bhagavad Gita* is at once a metaphysical system, a practical philosophy, a pattern of spiritual conduct, and an inspiring work of literature. Its interest and value are matched by few other books that have ever been written. To know it and love it is to share kinship with India and with mankind.

I, of course, know nothing of Sanskrit, and therefore am quite incompetent to judge of the accuracy and adequacy of Swami Nikhilananda's translation of this text from his Hindu Bible. I can only testify that his notes, comments, and introductions show every evidence not only of utter devotion to his task but also of profound and expert scholarship. As for the English text of the *Gita,* it is as clear as a flowing stream and as beautiful as the light of day. I have attempted to read more than one translation of this great work, and always have had trouble. The text has not been clear, or it was difficult to read—there was invariably some invisible barrier between my mind and the book. I have tried more than once to find passages for scriptural reading in my pulpit, but never with satisfactory results. This disappointment was true even of Mrs. Besant's translation, which has long been on my library shelves. But here is a translation which seems to meet every test of literature and learning. I have been reading it with ease and unflagging delight. At last I seem to have found the *Gita,* and to know why it is so great. Take Chapter XII, for example, "The Way of Divine Love," and see what it means for reading in these times!

Swami Nikhilananda is to be congratulated and thanked for his great achievement. Every student of religion and lover of the spirit stands in his debt.

Correspondence

Debts, Taxation, Income

To UNITY:

Doubtless many readers of UNITY feel exactly as Dr. John Haynes Holmes does with respect to the current confused newspaper discussion of the country's fiscal problems, and, like him, they find a glaring contradiction between the demand for heavier taxes and the assurance that the mounting and already unparalleled national debt bodes no ill to our economy and involves no threat to moderate prosperity or our living standards. May a student of *scientific* economics come to their aid?

No able and educated economist in this country or Europe has ever asserted, or implied, that we need *never* worry about our national debts, and that there is simply no limit to the amount we can safely and sanely borrow. On the contrary, Prof. Alvin A. Hansen and his school—the progressive new-deal school—have explicitly recognized the existence of a limit to sound borrowing. In his books and magazine articles (*Harper's, The Atlantic, The Yale Review*) Professor Hansen has made it abundantly clear that to go beyond the real and reasonable limit is to run the risk of bankruptcy and repudiation. What he and his school affirm is that the debt as it stands, or as it is likely to stand on the day the cease-firing order is given, need not unduly trouble us. Why? Because, if we are intelligent and constructive, we can, by rational economic measures and policies, not only prevent a serious decline in our national income, but actually augment that income, exceptionally high though it be. Plainly, a national income of seventy billion dollars could not support a debt, even at low interest rates, which an income of 142 billions—our present annual income or of 200 billions, a possible income for the United States under an enlightened and wise economy—could easily carry.

If we are foolish enough to try to return to normalcy, as the Deweys and Brickers and Byrds would have us do, then, indeed, repudiation of the debt will be inevitable. If we reject the guidance of the champions of so-called free enterprise, and proceed to enact the additional major reforms which the bankrupt system of capitalism and monopoly requires of us, then the debt problem will solve itself with substantial justice to all.

Just what the reasonable limit is, no one can tell us with any complete confidence. But the dependence of the limit on the national income is obvious to any thinking person. We now borrow to waste and destroy. After the war we should borrow, if necessary, only to build and improve, to increase income.

To pretend that the national debt need never be paid is to talk nonsense. It would be idiotic to go on paying interest on a debt for, say, a thousand years and then still owe the entire principal. No sane nation would do this. The debt should be gradually but steadily reduced, and so should the tax burden. In half a century the war debt could be fully discharged under a healthy and progressive economy.

Let us not pay much attention to partisan or newspaper "economists." Let us read and ponder the propositions of independent, scientific, progressive economists. I think it rather strange that Doctor Holmes has failed to seek a solution of his riddle in an authoritative work, such as Professor Hansen's.

La Jolla, California. VICTOR S. YARROS.

One More Letter

To UNITY:

I am sending one more letter which I wish I had the strength and the time to send to many publications. The process takes more of me than it formerly did, as I approximate my eighty-fourth birthday.

Many thoughtful persons are deeply troubled because of our disturbing political situation. Certain members of Congress appear to be so adolescent in their point of view as to be incapable of realizing the seriousness of our position before the world today, and are willing to risk the winning of the war and the peace if they can embarrass our President. Our soldiers, even as far away as the Pacific, are learning about all the disunity at home and are thinking (and saying it, too): Why should we risk our lives to save our country and the world, when by that act we forfeit our right to vote, as citizens of the United States of America! We see that the people at home are letting us down in more ways than one. Does not citizenship constitute the right to vote as a matter of course?

I, as an American who is jealous of the good standing of our country, its prestige among the nations of the world, as well as with the men of all our military forces—I am ashamed of the conduct of those men in Congress who have been elevated to a position for which they have few qualifications. They seem to have but one obsession—it cannot be called a "policy" because it lacks dignity and common sense—"to get rid of Roosevelt."

This is no time for stirring up of greater trouble and distress.

As we hope for Divine guidance and protection, we must act worthily.

MRS. SIDNEY A. SHERMAN.

Jamaica Plain, Mass.

Brotherhood

To UNITY:

I have followed with deep interest your long, unswerving struggle against the evil scourge in our midst—*racial intolerance.*

It is my earnest hope that the day will come soon when all members of the human race will be scientifically classified as to the type of their blood and not their race or color of the skin. When this fact has become widely accepted and known, we shall have gone a long way in destroying the evils of race prejudice and race hatred, paving the way toward universal human brotherhood.

Science must lead the way in bringing to reality the truth that "all men are brothers under the skin."

KEN M. NIKAIDO.

Kirkwood, Missouri.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, 15, Illinois

A MATTER OF POLICY

The Secretary of the Conference will be glad to visit any church when it wants or needs him. He is always ready to give what assistance he can. It has long been the policy of the Conference to request those churches which are able to do so to pay the expenses of the Secretary. Any contribution, whether more or less than, or equal to, the expenses of the Secretary is applied to the travel fund, thus enabling him to make visits to those churches not able to make such a contribution. However, do not hesitate to call upon the Secretary. At the present time the Secretary has Sunday appointments through the first Sunday in November. Also, he is booked for the first Sunday in December. Write to him now for the date that you want.

THE BOOK DEPARTMENT

The Book Department of the Western Unitarian Conference is a branch of the Beacon Press. It also orders direct from all publishers. Order your books and materials through the Western Unitarian Conference. Prompt and efficient service is guaranteed.

LAKE GENEVA

All records were broken for both advance registration and attendance at the Midwest-Unitarian Summer Assembly this year: 410 persons participated in the program of the conference. It was an inspiring and thrilling experience.

The general lecture each morning on the problems of the post-war world by Dr. Sunder Joshi was both enlightening and provocative. He analyzed the conflicting interests of the Big Four powers and amply demonstrated that no lasting peace could be built on a concept of the White Man's superiority.

Other general courses which proved popular were "Religion As a Philosophy of Life," by Dr. Arthur Murphy, of the University of Illinois; "The Modern Approach to the Bible," by Dr. E. Burdette Backus, Indianapolis; and "The History of Unitarianism," by Dr. Charles E. Snyder, Davenport, which was given instead of the course previously announced on "The Sources of Liberal Faith."

Specialized courses in Religious Education were given by Rev. Ernest Kuebler, Director of the Division of Education, American Unitarian Association; Mrs. Matilda Moore, Director of Religious Education of the Detroit church; Mrs. Lynnette Colbert, of Rochester, Minnesota; and Rev. Horton Colbert, minister of the Universalist Church, Rochester, Minnesota.

Rev. R. Lester Mondale, minister of the Unitarian Church in Kansas City, was the principal speaker for the young people. Workshops were led by Rev. John Gill, Alton; Rev. Josiah Bartlett, Seattle; Rev. Kenneth L. Patton, Madison; and Mrs. Martha Fletcher, Associate Director of the Youth Commission of the American Unitarian Association. Rev. Harold Marley, Dayton, completed Mr. Gill's workshop when Mr. Gill was called back to Alton. The A.U.Y. Conference was under the leadership of Rev. G. Richard Kuch, Rockford.

"The Function of Intelligence," was the subject of the Conference Sermon delivered by Rev. Ralph E. Bailey, Milwaukee. The Friday night lectures on Democracy were given by Senator Harold H. Burton, Moderator of the American Unitarian Association; and Mr. Earl B. Dickerson, Chicago attorney.

Mr. William Roger Greeley, President of the Unitarian Laymen's League, and Miss Sara Commins, President of the General Alliance, led discussions for their respective organizations. Mr. Fred McGill, Executive Director of the Laymen's League, assisted Mr. Greeley by taking over the course after Mr. Greeley returned to Boston.

The original poetry written and read by Rev. Kenneth L. Patton at the Firelight Service brought each day to an inspiring close. These services are to be published in the near future.

THE MINISTERS' INSTITUTE

Thirty-three ministers participated in the deliberations of the Ministers' Institute under the leadership of Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark of New Orleans. The results of the discussions were summarized in a statement prepared by a Findings Committee consisting of Rev. Kenneth L. Patton, Chairman; Rev. Harold Marley, and Wayne Shuttee. The statement was sent to the committees of the American Unitarian Association which are studying the basis of Unitarian advance.

MIDWEST A. U. Y.

The Midwest Committee of the American Unitarian Youth was organized at the Lake Geneva Conference. It is the regional branch of the national organization. Elected to the Council were:

Harriet Frink, Detroit, Michigan, Chairman.
Don C. Jameson, Lombard, Illinois.
Frieda Watson, Madison, Wisconsin.
Mary Cleveland, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Topsy Carberry, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Carolyn Dukacek, Omaha, Nebraska.
Jan Nicholas, St. Louis, Missouri.
Shirley Rhodes, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Ruth Davies, Cleveland, Ohio.

Ex-officio: Members of the National Council residing in the Middlewest.

WESTERN CONFERENCE R. E. COMMITTEE

Mrs. Charles H. Moran, Chairman; Mrs. Matilda Moore, Richard Kuch, and Randall S. Hilton—the Religious Education Committee of the Western Conference—met at Lake Geneva. Plans were made for the ensuing year. You will hear from the committee.

Order your church and church school supplies through
THE WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE